

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

SHARON K. WATSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-06-1337-HE
)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner,)	
Social Security Administration,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Plaintiff Sharon K. Watson instituted this action seeking judicial review of the defendant Commissioner's final decision denying her applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits. Consistent with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), the case was referred to Magistrate Judge Bana Roberts, who has recommended that the Commissioner's decision be affirmed.

The plaintiff objects to the Report and Recommendation, challenging the magistrate judge's conclusions that the administrative law judge ("ALJ") did not commit legal error when he failed to apply Social Security Ruling 83-20 and failed to obtain the assistance of a medical advisor to determine the onset date of the plaintiff's disability. The plaintiff did not contest the magistrate judge's determinations on her other claimed error.


The court has reviewed the record and given the plaintiff's objections de novo review. The court concurs with the magistrate judge's analysis and her conclusions that the ALJ was

not required to apply SR 83-20 or consult a medical advisor.¹ As determined by the magistrate judge, the services of a medical advisor were unnecessary because the medical evidence on the issue of whether the plaintiff had a disabling physical or medical impairment was not ambiguous.

Accordingly, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Robert's Report and Recommendation and **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's decision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 1st day of February, 2008.



JOE HEATON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹*Contrary to the plaintiff's assertion, the magistrate judge's analysis does not reflect that she ignored considerable medical evidence.*